



Paper No. 6

**THE LAW OFFICES OF MIKIO ISHIMARU**  
**1110 SUNNYVALE-SARATOGA ROAD**  
**SUITE A1**  
**SUNNYVALE, CA 94087**

**COPY MAILED**

**APR 07 2004**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

**ON PETITION**

In re Application of  
Bruce et al.  
Application No. 09/819,515  
Filed: March 27, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 23-002

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), filed March 26, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **granted**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply within three months to the non-final Office action mailed June 3, 2003. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were timely obtained. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on September 4, 2003.

Petitioner has met the requirements to revive the above-identified application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Accordingly, since the \$475.00 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on March

26, 2004 was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and a refund check will be mailed to petitioner.

The file is now being forwarded to Technology Center 2800 for further examination on the merits.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 306-0482.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Liana Chase".

Liana Chase  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

cc: SHABNEEZ KOTADIA  
BiMICRO Networks, Inc.  
45550 Northport Loop East  
Fremont, CA 94538